

Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia
vol. 19: 189–204 Kraków 2014
doi:10.4467/20843836SE.14.012.1655

Robert WOODHOUSE (Brisbane)

SOME GREEK ETYMOLOGIES^{*)}

Abstract. Five short articles are presented offering, in some, new etymological suggestions (§§ 1. μάχομαι ‘fight’, μισθός ‘reward’, 2. βούλομαι ‘want, wish’ : Slavic *gōľb ‘bare, naked’, 4. εἶλη ‘warmth, heat of the sun’), in others, comments on existing etymologies (§§ 1. μισθός ‘reward’, 3. οὖτα ‘wound’, 5. ὄνυξ ‘nail’ and delabialization by */ in North and East Germanic). Two of the items present alternatives to reconstructions with PIE *a (§§ 1, 3).

Keywords: Greek language, etymology, Slavic languages, Proto-Indo-European language

1. μάχομαι ‘fight’, μισθός ‘reward’

Svensson (2006: 295, n. 1) urges as “strong evidence” for PIE *a the correspondence set Lith. *magù*, *magėti* ‘please’, OCS *mogo*, *mošti* ‘be able’, Ved. *āmahe* (RV 7.92.2) ‘verschafft’ (‘gives, grants(?)’, takes(?) – Monier-Williams 1899: 146c s.v.; *mahe* ‘is able’ – Svensson, l.c.), OHG *magēn* ‘be able’, Gk. μάχομαι ‘fight’. The same set was apparently also discovered independently by Zehnder (LIV₂: 422) who supplies the semantic bridge linking ‘is able’ with ‘verschafft’ and cites as well the Ved. optative *sám mahema* ‘zustande bringen’.

The only guarantee of PIE *a in this set is Gk. μάχομαι ‘fight’, which is sufficiently distant semantically from the other words in Svensson’s comparison for Beekes (2010 s.v.) to find it “isolated” and probably of substrate origin. If we reject PIE *a and reconstruct instead *mh₂eg^h₁^{1,2} for the Greek word we expect to find a zero grade derivative *mh₂g^h₁tó which as a neuter substantive would mean

^{*)} I am grateful for the critical remarks of two anonymous reviewers that prompted me to seek, in one case, better support for my solution and, in another, a better solution, as well as correcting some errors and inadequacies.

¹ My PIE has only two series of velar/tectal sounds, viz. prevelars *k₁, *g₁ etc. conditionally reflected as palatovelars and plain velars and *k₂, *g₂ etc. positionally labialized in PIE and conditionally reflected as labiovelars and plain velars (Woodhouse 1998; 2005; MS). Though it is tempting to follow Kortlandt’s (1978: 238; 1979: 58; etc.) use of the traditional tritactal symbols for palatovelars and labiovelars for these two entities, such usage

*‘something that was fought’ and/or *‘something that was gained by fighting’³ and would yield, by Beekes’ law,⁴ Proto-Indo-Iranian (PII) **mij^htó* > Gathic *mīžda* /*mīžda*/ (for the phonemic interpretation see Beekes 1988a: 234; for the environment in which **H* > GAv. *i*, *ibid.* 85–87) n. ‘reward, prize’, i.e. ‘something that was gained by fighting’, as well as RV *mīdhá*/*mīlhá* n., not only, as in Gathic, ‘prize in a contest, reward’ but also ‘contest, strife’, i.e., ‘something that was actually fought’⁵ (for the formal development cf. PIE **lig^h-tó* > PII **rij^h-tó* > Ved. *rīdhá*-, cf. on the Iranian side Khot. *rīstā* ‘licks’, Mayrhofer, EWAia, 2 s.v. *REH*), i.e. a semantically and formally exact comparandum with Gk. *μᾶχουαι*.

It is no secret that the existing etymology of Ved. *mīdhá*, Gathic *mīžda* links these words with Gk. *μισθός* m. ‘wages, reward’, Gothic *mizdo* f. ‘id.’, OCS *mъzda* f. ‘id.’ as an IE inheritance, yet it is clear that if the etymology presented here is to be accepted then since **h₁* does not normally coalesce with PIE **i* in Greek, Germanic and Slavic the cited equivalents in these languages must be loans from PII just as it is accepted that Anatolian Indo-Aryan (AIA) **mizd^há* is the source of Hurrian/Akkadian *mištannu* ‘reward for capture of a fugitive’ (EWAia, 2 s.v. *mīdhá*).

The semantics of this situation seem particularly satisfying: if it is conceded that the capture of a fugitive will generally involve some sort of struggle then the first recorded meanings of our *mištannu* / *mīžda*- group – AIA ‘reward for capture of a fugitive’ and Ved. ‘contest, strife’ and ‘prize, reward’ – all involve the idea of ‘strife, struggle’ that is surely present in Gk. *μᾶχουαι*, whereas the loan equivalents

for a bitectal reconstruction is liable to lead to misunderstanding. Moreover, Kortlandt’s (1978: 237) attempt to provide typological support for his reconstruction was a failure (Woodhouse 1998: 41). The recent demolition by Mottausch (2011) of Lipp’s attempt to account for Luvo-Lycian tritectalism on the basis of an alternative bitectal reconstruction reveals the inadequacy of Lipp’s particular reconstruction.

² On **mh₂eg^h-* > **mag^h-* rather than **ṛmag^h-*, I agree with Schrijver (1991: 172) that “every syllable in IE. had a non-syllabic onset (words could not begin with vowels)”; see also Reynolds/West/Coleman 2000 and discussion in Woodhouse (2011: 152–56).

³ Cf. Ved. *nṛtā*- n. ‘dance, performance’, i.e. ‘something danced/performed’, to Ved. particip. *nṛtyant-*, perf. *nṛtur* ‘dance, perform’, Ved. *pūrtā*- n. ‘gift’, i.e. ‘something given’, to Ved. imperat. *pūrdhī* ‘give!’, Ved. *ghṛtā*- n. ‘ghee, clarified butter’ whether as ‘something dripped (on the fire)’, to Ved. *jigharti* ‘drip, sprinkle’, or ‘something gained/achieved by heating’, to Ved. *ghṛṇā*- ‘heat, glow’, and several others (see, e.g., Macdonell 1910: 120f.); the last of the above, Ved. *ghṛtā*- to *ghṛṇā*-, provides a particularly close parallel because the corresponding verb is attested only outside Vedic, e.g. Gk. *θερμαι* ‘warm oneself’, OCS *grējati grējō* ‘warm, heat’ etc. (Mayrhofer EWAia 1, s.vv. *GHAR*, *gharmā*-, *ghṛtā*-, *ghṛṇā*-).

⁴ See Beekes 1988b: 35; defended by Schrijver (1991: 161–172); further developed by Woodhouse (2011: 152, 155–164); appealed to without acknowledgement by Kümmel (LIV₂: 401 s.v. **leh₃-/3*).

⁵ This of course is not to be confused with post-Vedic and lexicographic *mīdhá*- ‘urine; faeces’ < **h₃mig^htó* (EWAia, 2 s.v. *MEH* ‘harnen’).

in Greek, Germanic and Slavic seem to have lost the specific idea of ‘struggle’ and signify merely a reward for good behaviour or services rendered.

This is in marked contrast with existing attempts at a deeper etymology of the group which leave much to be desired and – significantly – are all ignored by Beekes (2010 s.v. *μισθός*). They include such suggestions as the suffixing of PIE **d^hh₁ó* ‘place’ to the root of either Ved. *minā́ti* ‘exchange’, i.e. PIE **meiH-* (Meier-Brügger 1989: 59f. and n. 5, 6 with lit.), which captures only half the semantics, or Ved. *máyas* ‘refreshment, enjoyment, pleasure, delight’, Lat. *mī-tis* ‘mild, soft’, Lith. *mielas, mylas* ‘dear, tender’, SCr. *mǎo mǎla* ‘dear’ (EWAia, 2 s.v. *mīdhá*). For this latter the Balto-Slavic acute makes mandatory the laryngeal that Mayrhofer’s **mei(H)-* indicates as optional, making it phonologically identical with Meier-Brügger’s but with still weaker semantics. Phonologically, these attempts leave unexplained both the **s* in the alleged protoform and the short non-acute root vowel of OCS *mъzda*, Russ., Czech, USorb. *mzda*, which would somehow have to have escaped Hirt’s law.

There is however one detail of the phonology of my new suggestion that requires further attention, namely whether **h₁* or **H* in general between consonants yielded PII **i* sufficiently early to appear in the above European words looking in all other respects as if they derived directly from PIE, as has hitherto been commonly believed. In order to achieve this I believe we can hardly do better than find a demonstration, independent of Hurrian/Akkadian *mištannu*, that PIE **H > *i* in the oldest layer of Indo-Iranian⁶ available to us, viz. AIA.

Mayrhofer (1960: 137–139; 1966: 22, n. 4) sought to provide such a demonstration by equating the AIA onomastic component *-atti* with Ved. *átithi-* ‘guest’ < PII **atH₁thi-* and still thought this worth a mention in 1986 (when the corresponding fascicle of EWAia (p. 58) appeared), despite Kammenhuber’s (1968: 168f.) characterization of the equation as “unbewiesen”. Mayrhofer was of course aware of, and evidently not bothered by, the peculiarly Iranian syncopation of the target **i < *H*, which is odd given that AIA has no other exclusively Iranian features but several Indo-Aryan ones (n. 6 above) and the same suffix is found in non-AIA names such as *Te-ú-wa-at-ti*.⁷ One might argue that the

⁶ In the sense that we have no data for the Indo-Iranian branch of IE that is older; and while it may be true that AIA contains no exclusively Iranian features (see Mayrhofer 1966: 22–24) and that Kammenhuber’s (1968: 145) argument for an Iranian presence in AIA is entirely based on non-linguistic cultural considerations, specifically mythology, viz. the absence in AIA materials of a sharp contrast between the two groups of gods, the *ásura* (Mitra, Varuṇa) and the *devá* (the two Nāsatyās and Indra), it nevertheless remains the case that in Hurrian/Akkadian *mištannu* we have direct reflection of the cluster preserved in GAv. *mīžda* but simplified in all our Vedic and later Sanskrit texts.

⁷ The *e < *e/o_i* of our Vedic and Sanskrit texts was still *ai* in AIA, as in *a-i-ka-* ‘one’ in *a-i-ka-wa-ar-ta-an-na* ‘for one lap of the course’ (e.g. Kammenhuber 1968: 201; Mayrhofer EWAia, 1 s.v. *éka*-).

required syncope is due to enclosure of the putative **i* between similar consonants (for other examples of this phenomenon see Woodhouse 2008: 262), but Mayrhofer's demonstration still remains unconvincing. It would be nice, after all, to have an example in which *i* < **H* is actually preserved.

I think a better argument for the presence of AIA *i* < PIE **H* can be based on two other phonological conclusions. The first is that the so-called law of palatals has evidently taken place before the recording of AIA material, as is shown by AIA *pa-an-za-* '5' in *pa-an-za-wa-ar-ta-na* 'for five laps of the course' (e.g. Kammenhuber 1968: 204; Mayrhofer EWAia, 2 s.v. *pāñča*), which reflects both the palatalized backvelar as <ʒ> and the change of PIE **e* to PII *a*, a process that clearly postdates the palatalization. The second of our two conclusions is one probably achieved more recently, viz. that the palatal in Ved. *duhitár-* 'daughter' < **d^hug^hítér-* < **d^hug₂h₂tér-* is due to palatalization of the erstwhile backvelar (attested in Lith. *duktẽ* 'id.', OCS *db̑sti* 'id.' etc.) by the following *i* < **h₂*.⁸ This last statement may seem surprising to scholars aware of Kortlandt's repeated references (e.g. 1978: 238; 2005: 4) to "neutralization" of his two velar series (reaffirmed 2012: 1f.) after **u*, but, as I argue elsewhere (MS), first, the process was not one of neutralization but delabialization and, secondly, labiovelars were not uniformly labialized in the satem languages and certainly not in the environments reflecting PIE **d^hug₂h₂tér-/* **d^hug₂h₂tr⁻* in the dialects ancestral to Indo-Iranian, Balto-Slavic and almost certainly Albanian. Therefore the palatal in Ved. *duhitár* cannot be the result of delabialization because the consonant was not labialized to begin with. Since the outcome of the palatalization by *i* < **H* in *duhitár-* is the same as the palatalization of **g₂^h* by *i*/**e* under the law of palatals, e.g. Ved. *hánti* 'slays' < **g₂^hénti*, it is reasonable to assume that it was part of the same process. This is of course difficult to verify for Indo-Aryan alone but GAv. 1. sg. mid. */auji/* < **h₂eug₂h₂* (Beekes 1988a: 85) attests exactly the same process and has precisely the reflex of the aspirated backvelar palatalized under the law of palatals by a following front vowel (here *i* < **h₂*) (e.g. */jadyāi/* < **g₂^hen-*, Beekes 1988a: 72)⁹ and not that of an original prevelar or palatovelar (e.g. */hazah-/* < **séghes-*, *ibid.*); and despite the greater persistence of *i* < **H* in Indo-Aryan than in Iranian (see, e.g., Beekes 1988a: 85–87; Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 28) it can hardly be doubted that this palatalization was a single process affecting both branches simultaneously. Thus since the law of palatals has already occurred by the time of AIA, it is reasonable to assume the change **H* > *i* is also in place by this time.

⁸ I agree with Mayrhofer's (EWAia, 1 s.v. *OC*) acceptance of Tichý's suggestion that the pf. participle *okiváms-* 'be pleased' is a late form for **okváms-* and I note that despite pp. *ucitá-* no one seems inclined to reconstruct a set root.

⁹ Unfortunately the Sanskrit example "*jan-*" given there is an error for *han-*.

I think further support for this assumption can be found in the AIA occurrences of an onomastic element usually equated with the Vedic DN *Mitrá-* and generally agreed to figure in the DN *Mi-it-ra-aš-ši-il* which is recorded, along with other DN referable to Vedic Varuṇa, Indra and the two Nāsatyās, near the end of the lists of gods guaranteeing both versions of a contract or treaty between Šuppiluliuma I of Hatti and the Mitanni king KUR-tiwaza (Mayrhofer 1966: 14f., 22 n. 4; 1974: 13; Kammenhuber 1968: 143f.). Kammenhuber (1968: 144f.) points out that Thieme's idea that these were special contract gods works well for Mitra, whose name (allegedly) means 'contract', and also for Varuṇa and the two Nāsatyās, but not for Indra. This therefore begs the question whether the DN Mitra means 'contract' at all, let alone whether this was the original meaning of the name.

It seems to me that Mayrhofer's preference for deriving this Vedic DN from Ved. *mitrá-* m. 'contract' and his Ved. root *MAY'* 'befestigen' (EWAia 2, s.vv.), i.e. 'the one that binds', is incompatible with Macdonell's judgement that the name

must originally have meant 'ally' or 'friend', for the word often means 'friend' in the RV., and the Avestic Mithra is the guardian of faithfulness. As the kindly nature of the god is often referred to in the Veda, the term must in the beginning have been applied to the sun-god in his aspect of a benevolent power of nature (Macdonell 1917: 79).

Let us examine some Rigvedic contexts in which this judgement is borne out. All but one of the hymns deal with Mitra plus some other god, usually Varuṇa, and often with yet other gods as well, such as Aryaman, Agni, Savitṛ and so on. It will be convenient to consider the solitary hymn in which Mitra is addressed alone after we have examined contexts that associate Mitra with plenty and abundance in company with these other gods. In the texts and fragments reproduced below I have sometimes thought it wise in the interests of clarity to present forms from the Pada text, i.e. before the Classical Sanskrit rules of sandhi, i.e. phonetic word combination, are applied; the symbol $_$ indicates where this has been done.

In (RV) 5.62.9a and in 7.61.3b Mitra and Varuṇa are addressed with the epithet (dual) *sudānū* 'bestowing abundantly, bounteous, munificent', in the first instance + *gopā* 'guardians' (9b). In 5.67.4cd, Mitra, Varuṇa and Aryaman are described with the same epithet (pl.) followed by $_amhós cid uru-cákrayaḥ$ 'granting ample assistance even to resolve anxiety'. In 7.66.5b the same epithet (pl. *sudānavah*) is applied to Mitra and presumably Varuṇa and the other gods mentioned in 7.66.4bc, viz. Aryaman, Savitṛ and Bhaga. In 8.25.11b the same epithet (pl.) must refer not only to Mitra and Varuṇa, who are the focus of stanzas 1–9, but also to Aditi, the two Nāsatyās and the Maruts, who are all mentioned in 8.25.10.

In 5.70.2ab a request is addressed to Mitra and Varuṇa: ... *vām samyāg* ... | *īṣam aśyāma dhāyase* ‘... from you two may we gain complete refreshment for sustenance’. In 7.64.2cd we find *ilām no mitrāvarunā utā vṛṣṭīm āva divā invataṃ jīradānū* ‘send down to us food and rain, Mitra and Varuṇa, you who send down in abundance’. In 10.132.2a Mitra and Varuṇa are (du.) *dharayāt-kṣitī* ‘sustainers’ of *kṣitī*-, the latter signifying anything from a single habitation to whole nations.

In 1.41.1b, 2 we find ... *vāruṇo mitrō aryamā* ... || *yām bāhūteva pīprati pānti mārtyam riśāḥ* | *āriṣṭaḥ sārva edhate* || ‘every mortal, whom Varuṇa, Mitra and Aryaman as if by the armful fill (or enrich) and protect, thrives safe from harm’. 7.62.3ab has *vī naḥ sahāsraṃ śurūdho radantu* *ṛtāvāno vāruṇo mitrō agnīḥ* ‘may holy Varuṇa, Mitra (and) Agni bestow on us a thousand refreshments/boons’.

In RV 3.59, the one hymn entirely devoted to Mitra himself, he is described as one supporting people (*carṣaṇīdhṛta*-, 6a) as supporting all the gods (*devān viśvān bibharti*, 8c), and as a provider of food according to desired ordinances (*īṣa iṣṭā-vratā akah*, 9c) to the man whose sacrificial grass is spread (*jānāya vṛktā-barhiṣe*, 9b). In this last example we can perhaps see the idea of a ‘contract’ or perhaps rather a ‘contractor’ or ‘ordainer’, coming to the fore; but equally we can see a meaning such as ‘apportioner’ being appropriate.

Also in this hymn (3.59.4b) Mitra is described as being born a *vedhās*-, an epithet of uncertain meaning and etymology which Macdonell (1917: 81) renders ‘disposer’, a translation that for me lacks clarity. Like Mitra himself, this word also occurs in several RV contexts suggesting once again ‘liberally bestowing plenty and abundance’. While these contexts do not necessarily prove that this is the original meaning of the word, they do show that the word is compatible with this meaning. Some of these contexts now follow (the stem form *vedhās*-, without hyphen, has been inserted in place of the target word in the translations that follow, sometimes functioning as a substantive, sometimes as an adjective):

1.72.1: *nī kāvyā vedhāsaḥ śāsvasas kar hāste dādhanō nāryā purūṇi* | *agnīr bhuvad rayi-pātir* *rayīṇām satrā cakrāṇō amṛtāni viśvā* || ‘he has humbled the higher powers of every *vedhās*, bestowing many gifts for men into (their) hand, has Agni, and has become treasure-lord of treasures, having forever prepared all the worlds of the immortals.’

1.156.5: *ā yō viyāya sacāthāya dāivya indrāya viśnuḥ sukṛte sukṛttarah* | *vedhā ajinvat tri-śadhassthā āryam ṛtasya bhāgé yājamānam ā* *abhajat* || ‘heavenly Vishnu, *vedhās*, triple-throned, who came for companionship to Indra (one of greater benevolence to one already benevolent), has assisted the respectable man and caused the worshipper to share in his portion of holy law.’

1.181. 1d, 7a: in 1d the twin Ásvins are addressed as *vásu-dhitī ávitārā janānām* ‘treasure-bestowers, protectors of humankind’ and in 7a as *vedhasā* (du.).

4.2.20: *etā te agna ucāthāni vedhó_avocāma kavāye tā juṣasva| út_śo-casva kṛṇuhi vásyaso no mahó rāyāḥ puruvāra prā yandhi||* ‘We have sung these praises to you, the *vedhás*, the poet (or sage), Agni, do enjoy them; blaze up, make us richer and grant great riches, you who are rich in gifts.’

6.14.1–2ab: *agnā yó mártyo dúvo dhīyaṃ jujósa dhītibhiḥ| bhásat_nú śá prā pūrvyá iṣaṃ vurīta ávase|| agnir id_hí prácetā agnir vedhástama řsiḥ|* ‘Whatever mortal has pleasure in granting his gift and devotion to Agni through his prayers, let him in consequence eat before the rest (and) may he choose his food for enjoyment! For Agni is indeed attentive (or observant or mindful), Agni is a (or the) most *vedhás* seer.’

6.16.20, 22: – 20: *sá hí víśvā_áti pářthivā rayiṃ dā́sat_mahi-tvanā| vanván_ávāto ástrtaḥ||* ‘For he gave riches while conquering all the regions of the earth, (being) through his greatness untroubled and invincible.’ – 22: *prā vaḥ sakhāyo agnáye stómaṃ yajñāṃ ca dhṛṣṇuyā| árcā gāya ca vedhāse||* ‘(Bring) forth, friends, for your Agni, laud and sacrifice, each of you offer praise and sing for your *vedhás*.’

6.22.3, 10, 11: – 3: *tám īmaha indram asya rāyāḥ puru-vīrasya nrvātaḥ puru-kśóḥ| yó áskṛdhoyur ajāraḥ svār-vān tám ā bhara harivo mādayádhyai||* ‘We implore the same Indra for some of that wealth fitting for men and consisting of many heroes and much food, and which is abundant, undecaying, celestial; bring it, lord of bay horses, for gladdening.’ – 10: *ā saṃyátam indra ṇaḥ svastīm śatrutūryāya bṛhatīm ámḍhrām| yáyā dā́sāni_áryāni vṛtrá káro vajrint sutūkā náhuṣāni||* ‘(Bring) hither, Indra, for the overcoming of our foes, uninterrupted prosperity, abundant and inexhaustible, through which do you, wielder of the thunderbolt, make our neighbouring enemies, both barbarous and esteemed, flee swiftly.’ – 11: *sá no niyúdbhiḥ puruhūta vedho víśvā-vārābhir ā gahi prayajyo| ná yā ádevo várate ná devā ābhir yāhi tūyam ā madryadrík||* ‘Come hither to us, much invoked, adorable *vedhás*, with your team of horses which bestow all treasures and which neither the ungodly nor any god restrains, come with them quickly to me!’

8.43.11, 33: – 11: *ukṣ-ānnāya vaśānnāya sóma-prṣṭhāya vedhāse| stó-mair vidhema_agnāye||* ‘Let us honour ox-eating, cow-eating, *vedhás*

Agni bearing Soma on his back, with our praises.’ – 33: *tát te sahasva īmahe dātram yāt_na_upa-dāsyati| tvád agne vāryam vāsu||* ‘We pray to you, Mighty Agni, for the allotted portion that does not fail, a precious treasure from you.’

9.26.3: *tām vedhām medhāyā_ahyan pávamānam ádhi dyávi| dharnasīm bhūri-dhāyasam||* ‘Through wisdom they have sent him, the *vedhás*, the purified (Soma), the strong, the nourisher of many, to the sky.’

9.102.4: *jajñānām saptá mātáro vedhām aśāta śrīyé| ayām dhruvó rayīñām ciketa yāt||* ‘When he (Soma) was just born the seven mothers taught him as a *vedhás* for glory; and so he, being strong, set his mind on wealth.’

From the above, and especially since several of the above contexts refer to Agni, who is hailed e.g. in RV 1.27.6 with the words *vibhaktā_asi* ‘you are the distributor (or apportioner)’, I assume that Macdonell’s “disposer” means much the same as ‘benefactor, dispenser, distributor, apportioner; Zuteiler’. This suggests that *vedhás*-, with *guṇa* root and the same suffix as *apás*- ‘active’ (beside *āpas*- ‘work’), *tyajás*- m. ‘descendant’ (*‘the one who remains behind’) and other agent adjectives and substantives (Macdonell 1910: 114), can indeed be reconnected with the newly formed Vedic root *vidh*- which Mayrhofer (EWAia 2 s.v. *VIDH*) glosses ‘zuteilen, Genüge tun, zufriedenstellen’, finding the first two of these meanings also combined in the nasal present *vindhe* (RV 1.7.7; contra Monier-Williams 1899: 967c s.v. *vidh*/2).

Now it is true that Mayrhofer (l.c. et s.v. *vedhás*-) rejects this connection of *vedhás*- with *vidh* on the basis of (i) the newness of the root (< preverb *vi* ‘apart’ + **d^hh₁* ‘place, bestow’) and (ii) an alleged connection of *vedhás*- with GAv. *vazdah*- ‘constant’ (‘beständig’, Bartholomae 1904 s.v.), a connection for which there is only phonological support. There are several things against Mayrhofer’s rejection. First, the absence of an accent on the alleged preverb *vi* (see RV 8.43.11 and cf. *ví* in 7.62.3, both quoted above) and the existence of the acknowledged nasal present *vindhe* indicate that *vidh* had become regarded by Vedic speakers as an ordinary root from which new derivatives could be made. Secondly, Epic Sanskrit has *vedhas*- ‘creator’, a meaning that can be seen as a natural outcome of being a ‘benefactor’ (cf. Eng. *to make a person something, to make them what they are* in a positive sense, i.e. by giving them the appropriate assistance, opportunities etc. and so being their benefactor). Consequently I propose that the connection of *vedhás*- with *vidh* is sound.

Having now arrived at the possibility that the original meaning of the DN *Mitrá* may well be ‘apportioner; Zuteiler’, rather than ‘contract’, we are in a position

to suggest derivation instead from Mayrhofer's Ved. root $M\bar{A}^2$ 'messen, abmessen, zumessen, zuteilen' (EWAia 2 s.v.) < PIE $*meh_1-$, with *Mitrá-* m. < $*mh_1-tró-$ again by Beekes' law with the same agent suffix as in *a-trá-* (< $*ad-trá-$) 'eater', *vr-trá-* 'foe' (Macdonell 1910: 124).¹⁰

Thus we have our second example (after Hurrian/Akkadian *mištannu*) of AIA *i* < PIE $*H^{11}$ and thus as much support as I am able to muster for my new explanation of the origin of Gk. *μισθός* etc.

Such can be the benefits of rejecting PIE $*a$.

Additional remark. The apparent root $*m\bar{d}h$ seen by Mayrhofer (l.c.) also in the apparent perf. act. participle RV *mīḍhvāṁs*, f. *mīḍhvuṣṭī* 'bestowing richly, bountiful, liberal' < $*\text{'rich in rewards/rewarding'}$, which Monier-Williams (1899: 818b s.v. *mih*) treats as an adjective that has taken on a participial inflection, has presumably been backformed from RV *mīḍhá* n. 'reward' with the meaning 'apply/bestow a reward or rewards' in the same proportion as RV *yugá* n. 'yoke' bears to *yuj* 'apply a yoke or yokes'. The lack of reduplication is only a small peculiarity: Macdonell (1910: 235f.) lists corresponding unreduplicated participles for three other roots, viz. *vidvāṁs* 'knowing' and *dāśvāṁs* 'worshipping' (cf. *dāśá-* $*\text{'act of worshipping'}$ in *puro-dāśá-* m. 'oblation; prayer') and possibly *sāhvāṁs* 'having overcome' (no doubt influenced, however, by reduplicated *sāśahvāṁs* 'having conquered' from the same root, cf. *sahá-* 'powerful, mighty'), and there may be some significance in the fact that the first two are also glossed with present participles.

2. βούλομαι 'want, wish' : Slavic $*g\bar{o}lb$ 'bare, naked', with a note on λοέω 'wash'

Greek βούλομαι 'wish, want, prefer' is without extra-Greek IE congeners, judging by Beekes' (2010 s.v.) treatment. Kümmel (LIV₂ s.v. $*g^u elh_3-$ n. 1) agrees, unless OCS *želěti* 'wünschen, begehren' is cognate. Kümmel (LIV₂: 246) mentions the latter s.v. $*h_g u^h el-$ > Gk. *ἐθέλω* 'wish, want' but is inclined to believe

¹⁰ This is not to say that *mitrá-* 'contract' may not be cognate, though with a different basic meaning of 'apportioning (benefits and responsibilities)' rather than the bleak one of 'binding' the participants to something none of them may want. After all, the NHG synonym *Vertrag* seems originally to have had the notion 'what each takes and bears for himself' (see Kluge/Seebold 1999 s.v.; Wasserzieher 1963: 429), which seems to agree with the idea of apportionment; and our Latin-based equivalents *contract* literally 'a drawing together' and *covenant* literally 'a coming together' suggest that agreement on the scope of each party's contribution is the original basis of a contract, not a 'binding' coercion.

¹¹ Incidentally, Finnish *mitta* 'measure, measurement' seems likely to be loan from PII $*mitá-$ 'measured' < PIE $*mh_1tó-$ again by Beekes' law (Beekes 1988b: 35) > RV (*pári-vi-*) *mita-*, Pali *mita-*.

that the OCS word really belongs with RuCS *želěti* ‘trauern’ (LIV₂ s.v. **g^uelH-/1*). This agrees with Kümmel’s cross-reference to **g^uelH-/1* s.v. **g^uelh₃-* (n. 1) but not with Derksen’s (2008: 555) separation of these two CS homonyms by deriving the RuCS word from PIE **g^welH-* and the OCS one from PIE “**g^wh₁el-*” (Derksen citing, for unclear reasons, the later Gk. form *θέλω* ‘wish, want’). The laryngeal in **g^welH-* accounts for the acute in Lith. *gėlti* ‘ache’ and, also, according to Kortlandt (1985: 117), in SCr. *žālitī* ‘mourn, grieve, regret’, Cz. *želiti* ‘regret, deplore, grieve’ – assuming the Dutch scholar had in mind this shape and not **g^weHl-*.

Since the semantic shift from ‘want, wish’ to ‘pine, be ill, feel pain, feel sorrow, grieve’ has been rehearsed elsewhere (e.g. Woodhouse 2003) it is clear that there is no semantic prohibition against Kümmel’s tentative suggestion of a connection between Gk. *βούλωμαι* ‘wish, want, prefer’ and RuCS *želěti* ‘regret, grieve’ and therefore, more to the point, the question arises whether Derksen’s separation of the Slavic forms into two homonymous roots of differing origin is justified.

The first nail in the coffin of this separation is the fact that there does not seem to be anything obligatory about the alleged laryngeal in SCr. *žālitī*, Cz. *želeti*. First, SCr. *žālitī* can have its short falling tone by shortening in trisyllabic forms in the same way as *sŕce* and *mlādot* (Kortlandt 2002: 1, 17) and this supports the idea that this verb is a denominative from Slavic **žalb* ‘grief, regret, pity’ which by all accounts lost its laryngeal in the lengthened grade of the original root noun (Kortlandt 1985: 117; Derksen 2008: 553f.), bearing in mind that the reassignment of a verb from the normal denominative *ě*-stem class to the *i*-stems is not uncommon in Serbo-Croat (Leskien 1914: 473, 465). Secondly, the root syllable of Cz. *želeti*, which does not necessarily reflect the Czech *přehláska*, appears to have the same tone as that of, say, Cz. *žena* ‘woman, wife’, which is not usually thought of as having an acute.

The second nail in the coffin follows from the fact that the Czech verb appears to be the only verb of this shape with the ‘regret’ meaning in a modern Slavic language while within Czech it does not have beside it any contrasting similar form having the ‘wish, want’ meaning. Likewise between OCS and RuCS there seems to be a neat cleavage between these two related meanings. From these facts it appears we have essentially a single verb in Slavic, the verb surfacing in any given language with one or other of the possible stem suffixes and one or other of the two indicated meaning types.

Possibly this verb represents a conflation of two different etyma, possibly not. Possibly all the Slavic forms are cognate with Lith. *gėlti* but lost the laryngeal early through analogy with the (originally root) noun **gėli-* < **g₂ēlH-*. Equally possible is that all the Slavic verbs are cognate not with Lith. *gėlti* and Gk. *βούλωμαι* but with Gk. *ἐθέλω* instead. This would not be the only instance of Baltic and Slavic differing in their retention of PIE etyma (see e.g. Woodhouse 2012a: 151).

If the second of these possibilities is accepted, then the close semantic connection between ‘desire’ and ‘lack’ encapsulated in our English gloss *want* suggests

the possibility of connecting Gk. *βούλομαι* (and of course Lith. *gėlti*) with Slavic **gōlb* ‘bare, naked’, i.e. ‘lacking in some kind of covering’. Filling out the semantics on the Slavic side are associated words such as Russ. *gol* ‘the poor’, Russ. dial. *golotá* ‘id.’, Cz. *holota* ‘id.; nakedness’ and, best of all, Slovak *holota* ‘emptiness, poverty, nakedness’. In view of the facts (1) that for ‘poverty’ here one can substitute ‘want’, and (2) that Slavic also possesses **nâgb* ‘naked’, continuing what appears to be the original PIE etymon for this meaning (nicely summarized by de Vaan 2008 s.v. *nūdus*), it would seem that there are good reasons for supposing that the primary meaning of **gōlb* may not always have been ‘nudity, nakedness’, but ‘needy, wanting, lacking’ and the like.

Derksen’s (2008 s.v.) reconstruction of **gōlb* as **golH-* represents bitectal **g₂olH-* and can without difficulty be equated with Kümmel’s Peters-inspired **g^uelh₃-* for *βούλομαι* (LIV₂: 208f. s.v.). There are however some formal difficulties on the Greek side of this equation which will now be addressed.

The process by which Peters’ **h₃* generates **o* in the root syllable of *βούλομαι* is said to be a regular metathesis, thus **-elh₃e- > *-elo- > -ole-* in Pamphylian *βολεμενυς* (Peters 1980: 349 n. 52; 1986: 310). But the lengthened root vowel of *βούλομαι* is usually explained in terms of a nasal present and it is hard to see how an apparent *o*-grade could become the basis of such a present (Beekes 2010 s.v. with nothing concrete to add).

I think a solution can be found if we begin with the meaning ‘council’ of *βουλή*, which word, I suggest, is a derivative of *βούλομαι*. A council is a gathering that encourages its members to voice in turn their favoured or desired course of action. It is conceivable that this might encourage the use of an iterative middle form of the associated verb, specifically **g^wolh₃ei-e/o- > *g^woloi-e/o- > *βολο-ε/o-*, a verb of unusual structure in early Greek, there being, according to Tucker (1990: 275), only two other verbs recorded in Homer with stem final radical *o*, i.e. **h₃*, the remaining *o*-stem verbs being derived from *o*-stem nominals, which are generally agreed to be a later phenomenon within PIE. The two other verbs with stems in radical *o* are represented by 3rd pl. *ἀρόωσιν* ‘plough’ (Od. 9.108), which appears to have essentially retained its original shape, and *λό(ε)* ‘washed’ (Od. 10.361) thought to be metathesized from **lewo- < *leuh₃-* (Beekes 2010 s.v. *λούω*) like Pamphylian *βολεμενυς* mentioned above, which would thus constitute a third example of the type.

I propose that the medial segment of **βολο-ε/o-* early tended to undergo the contraction of **oe > ov* evidenced in Il. 6.508 *λούεσθαι* ‘to be washed’ and of **oo > ov* as in Od. 10.240 *νοῦς < νοός* ‘mind’ yielding in both cases an apparent contracted thematic stem **βολου-*. This underwent metathesis, in the same way as **lewo- > λό(ε)*, yielding in the first instance *βουλο-* in which the apparently thematic *o* induced thematic *ε* in *βουλε-* in those forms of the paradigm in which this theme was characteristic.

This derivation raises the prospect that, while Pamphylian *βολεμενυς* may indeed exemplify the kind of metathesis required in the above explanation of *βούλομαι*, the derivation of the essentially active meaning of *λοέω*, cf. impf. *λοέον* 1. sg. (Od. 4.252), might better begin and end with the causative/iterative **lou-éi-e/o-*, given that washing, like knocking, frequently requires a series of repeated similar actions.

3. *οὔτα* ‘wound’

Kümmel (LIV₂: 307) reconstructs **h₃uath₂* with **a* based on Lith. *votìs* (accent paradigm [AP] 4) ‘nasty sore’, Latv. *vāts* ‘(suppurating) wound, gash’ but these East Baltic words do not require **ā* either, since East Baltic makes no distinction at all between traditional pre-Baltic **uā-* and **uō-* (Woodhouse 2011: 173). Moreover, the substitution of analogical **ā*-grade for inherited **ō*-grade in other contexts is also a well known phenomenon in Baltic (Stang 1966: 39–44).

Beside Lith. *votìs* is the older variant *vótis* (AP 1), which Derksen (1996: 147f.) thinks is the original form because the spread of AP 4 in *i*-stems is a well known phenomenon in Lithuanian. Both this variant and Latv. *vāts* point to an internal laryngeal within the root, and the Greek word is surely compatible with this. Smoczyński (2007: 767f.) agrees with an internal laryngeal but his connection of the Baltic words with Lat. *uānus* ‘empty’, Ved. *váyati* ‘fade away’ is semantically less appropriate. This encourages the setting up of **h₃uh₁oth₂-* for Baltic and **h₃euhi₁th₂-* > Gk. **ōeta* > *οὔτα* by contraction, as above (*βούλομαι*). This in its involvement of all three laryngeals is, as far as I know, comparable only with my suggestions **h₂eihi₁h₃* and **h₂h₁éih₃-* for linking Hitt. *hēu* / *hē(y)aw* ‘rain’ with Gk. *αἰονάω* ‘moisten’, both of which were seemingly eclipsed by an anonymous reviewer who proposed **h₂ei-* instead (Woodhouse 2012b: 229f.). Such over-laryngealization of the root (or both roots) may be the reason for its (their) poor retention rate in IE languages.

4. *εἶλη* ‘warmth, heat of the sun’

Beekes (2010 s.v.) derives the variants of this *εἶλη*, *ἐλη*, *βέλα* = *φέλα* unproblematically from PIE **suel(H)-* but finds the forms *εἶλη*, *εἶλη* with lengthened root vowel an insoluble problem “[u]nless there is an unknown phonetic development”.

I think the solution is as follows. The more interesting Greek dialect forms of *ἥλιος* ‘sun’ are derived from **seh₂u-el-* by Beekes (2010 s.v.) who takes care to point out the insuperable structural differences, and therefore the impossibility of direct relationship, between this and our target word representing **suel(H)-*. But since the target word means ‘heat from the sun’ and is therefore likely to call

to mind the word for ‘sun’, if not actually be frequently combined with it in speech, there is surely a distinct possibility that somewhere in the Greek speech area the somewhat similar ‘sun’ word will have communicated something of its rhythm to the ‘heat from the sun’ word, **suel(H)*- x **seh₂u-el-* resulting in **seu-el(H)*- from which, with the usual lapse of consonantal **u* and the usual contraction, the target forms *εἴλη* and (with psilosis) *εἴλη* result.

5. *ὄνυξ* ‘nail’ and delabialization by **l* in North and East Germanic

In order to account for the Cowgill’s law conversion of the root vowel **o > u*, Derksen (2008: 355 s.v. *nogà*) assumes a root final labiovelar. Two years later, Beekes (2010 s.v.) is more circumspect, allowing something like the choice offered by Vine (1999: 559) between original labiovelar (in Greek alone, according to Vine) and plain velar converted to labiovelar by a *u*-suffix attested in Balto-Slavic derivatives. Vine, admitting that evidence for such a *u*-stem is absent from Greek, is prepared to invoke instead the labiality of the initial laryngeal as part of the trigger, relying here on Hamp’s example *πρὺμνός* of alleged non-contiguous triggering **n* (Vine 1999: 555), for which, however, Vine (p. 558) appears to prefer Dunkel’s explanation of inherited parallel forms with **o : *u*.

I think the labiovelar solution, with the original labiovelar delabialized in Greek by the newly arisen preceding *u* (§ 1 above), is correct and cannot be denied by any of the cognates mentioned by Derksen, viz. Lat. *unguis* (surely reflecting the labiality of the labiovelar), OIr. *ingen* and OHG *nagal*, cf. OHG *singan* beside Goth. *siggwan*, ON *syngva*, *syngja* ‘sing’. These last items raise the question of the non-labiality of Goth. *ga-naglǵands* ‘having nailed’, ON *nagl* *l*-stem ‘nail’, which I think is taken care of by the following *-l-* much as in Gothic *fl-* is delabialized to *pl-* except when PIE **o* follows (Woodhouse 2000). A similar dual treatment of labiovelars before *l* can then be detected in the retention of labiality before PIE **lo* in PGM. **hwehwlan* / **hwegwlan* > ON *hjól*, *hvel*, OE *hweól*, *hweogul*, *hweowol* ‘wheel’ (thus Orel 2003: 199 s.v. **xwezwlān* ~ **xwexwlān*).

Vine is also puzzled by the retention of the root initial laryngeal in the *o*-grade, contra de Saussure’s law, which is perhaps not critical – Beekes (2010 s.v. *οὐλή* e.g.) consistently writes “Saussure Effect”, not “Law”.

Robert Woodhouse
School of Languages and Comparative Cultural Studies
The University of Queensland
Brisbane QLD 4072, Australia
[r.woodhouse@uq.edu.au] [jandrwoodhouse@bigpond.com]

References

- Bartholomae, Christian, 1904, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner [1979, Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter].
- Beekes, Robert Stephen Paul, 1988a, *A grammar of Gatha-Avestan*. Leiden / New York / Copenhagen / Cologne: E.J. Brill.
- , 1988b, PIE. *RHC-* in Greek and other languages, *IF* 93: 22–45.
- , 2010, *Etymological dictionary of Greek* (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series 10). Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Brandenstein, Wilhelm and Mayrhofer, Manfred, 1964, *Handbuch des Altpersischen*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Derksen, Rick, 1996, *Metatony in Baltic* (Leiden studies in Indo-European 6). Amsterdam / Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- , 2008, *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series 4). Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- EWAia = Mayrhofer, Manfred, 1992–2001.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies, 1968, *Die Arier im Vorderen Orient*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Kluge, Friedrich, 1999, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 23. erweiterte Auflage, bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kortlandt, Frederik, 1978, I.-E. palatovelars before resonant in Balto-Slavic, in *Recent developments in historical phonology* (Trends in linguistics, Studies and monographs 4). The Hague / Paris / New York: Mouton. Pp. 237–243.
- , 1985, Long vowels in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 21/2: 112–124.
- , 2002, From Proto-Indo-European to Slavic, www.kortlandt.nl
- , 2005, From Serbo-Croatian to Indo-European, www.kortlandt.nl
- , 2012, The early chronology of long vowels in Balto-Slavic, www.kortlandt.nl
- Kümmel, Martin, see LIV₂.
- Leskien, August, 1914, *Grammatik der serbo-kroatischen Sprache*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- LIV₂ = 2001, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, ed. Helmut Rix assisted by Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer, 2nd rev. ed. by Martin Kümmel and Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony, 1910, *Vedic grammar* (Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, Bd. 1: Allgemeines und Sprache, Heft 4). Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner [1968, Delhi: Indological Book House].
- , 1917, *A Vedic reader for students*. London: Oxford University Press [1970, Madras].
- Mayrhofer, Manfred, 1960, Indo-iranisches Sprachgut aus Alalah, *Indo-Iranian journal* 4: 136–149.

- Mayrhofer, Manfred, 1966, *Die Indo-Arier im Alten Vorderasien*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- , 1974: *Die Arier im Vorderen Orient – ein Mythos?* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 294. Bd., 3. Abhandlung). Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- , 1992–2001, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, 3 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Monier-Williams, (Sir) Monier, 1899 [1974], *A Sanskrit-English dictionary*, new edition, greatly enlarged and improved. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mottausch, Karl-Heinz, 2011, „Satemisierung“ im Luwo-Lykischen?, *HS* 124: 66–83.
- Orel, Vladimir, 2003, *A handbook of Germanic etymology*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Peters, Martin, 1980, Attisch τραῦμα: griechische Etymologie und indogermanische Labiolaryngale, in *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie*, ed. Manfred Mayrhofer, Martin Peters, Oskar E. Pfeiffer (Akten der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wien, 24.–29. September 1978). Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
- , 1986, Zur Frage einer ‘achäischen’ Phase des griechischen Epos, in *O-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Annemarie Etter. Berlin.
- Reynolds, Elinor and West, Paula and Coleman, John, 2000, Proto-Indo-European ‘laryngeals’ were vocalic, *Diachronica* 17/2: 351–387.
- Schrijver, Peter, 1991, *The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Latin* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 2). Amsterdam / Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- Smoczyński, Wojciech, 2007, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Vilnius: Philological Faculty, Vilnius University.
- Stang, Christiaan S., *Vergleichende Grammatik der Baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo / Bergen / Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- Svensson, Miguel Villanueva, 2006, Traces of *o-grade middle root aorists in Baltic and Slavic, *HS* 119: 295–317.
- Tucker, Elizabeth Fawcett, 1990, *The creation of morphological regularity: early Greek verbs in -ēō, -āō, -ōō, -ūō, and -īō* (HS Ergänzungsheft 35). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Vaan, Michiel de, 2008, *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages* (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series 7). Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Vine, Brent, 1999, On “Cowgill’s law” in Greek, in *Compositiones indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, ed. Heiner Eichner et al. Prague. Pp. 555–600.
- Wasserzieher, Ernst, 1963, *Woher? Ableitendes Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 16. neubearbeitete Auflage, besorgt von Werner Betz, (Dümmlerbuch 8301). Bonn / Hannover / Hamburg / Kiel / München: Ferd. Dümmler.
- Woodhouse, Robert, 1998, On PIE. tectals, *IF* 103: 40–60.

- Woodhouse, Robert, 2000, Gothic *þl-* : *fl-* variation is due to ablaut, not interdialectal borrowing, *SEC* 5: 145–147.
- , 2003, PIE. **s(w)er(H)K-* ‘heed, care for, grieve, lie ill, waste away’?, *IF* 108: 58–91.
- , 2005, Assibilative palatalization of tectals in Phrygian, *IF* 110: 205–234.
- , 2008, The distribution of the reflexes of Proto-Slavic **ǫ* in the Freising Texts: an updated restatement, *HS* 121: 254–279.
- , 2011, Lubotsky’s and Beekes’ laws, PIE **(H)r*, **(H)i(V)*, **a*, and some other laryngeal matters, *SEC* 16: 151–187.
- , 2012a, Slavic **edŕn* ‘one’ and Winter’s law, *SEC* 17: 151–178.
- , 2012b, Hittite etymologies and notes, *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 129: 225–244.
- , MS, Delabialization after **u* and the distribution of labiovelars in dialectal PIE.
- Zehnder, Thomas, see LIV₂.

